

Jung-hua Kuo

Attorney at Law

P.O. Box 3275
Los Altos, California 94024
Tel: 650-988-8070
Fax: 650-988-8090
jkuo@kuolaw.com

Via Electronic Mail

September 8, 2003

Confidential Attorney-Client Communication

Renee Collacino
IP Paralegal
Plantronics, Inc.
345 Encinal Street
Santa Cruz, California 95060

Re: Draft U.S. Patent Application Entitled "Adaptive Sidetone And Adaptive Voice Activity
Detect (VAD) Threshold For Speech Processing"
Inventor: Reuss Filed: Not yet filed
Your File No.: PLANP024 Attorney Docket No.: 01-7095

Dear Renee:

Enclosed for the inventor's review is a draft of the above-referenced patent application. Also enclosed is a guide for the inventor in reviewing the patent application. Please review the application, interlining any changes to the patent application. After your reviews, please forward any comments to me so that I can make appropriate revisions and file the patent application.

Thank you in advance for your attention and assistance in this matter. I look forward to receiving your comments regarding the enclosed draft patent application. If you have any questions or comments in the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,



Jung-hua Kuo

Enclosures
cc: Edward L. Reuss

Jung-hua Kuo

Attorney at Law

INVENTOR'S GUIDE TO REVIEWING OF THE PATENT APPLICATION

Your review of this patent application should not be limited to ensuring that the description is accurate and complete from a technical point of view. There are several issues you must also consider so that we can be certain a valid patent will ultimately be obtained. The important issues and questions you should consider are listed below.

1. You have an obligation to disclose the best way of making and using your invention. Are you aware of anything that could make your invention "better" which we have not disclosed?

2. Who contributed to conception of the claimed ideas? If we have not included one or more inventors, please provide their names, home addresses, and citizenships. On the other hand, be sure we have not listed anyone who did not contribute to conception of the ideas recited in the claims. If you have any questions about who should be properly named, we should discuss this issue.

3. Could someone readily make and use the invention based only upon the disclosure in the patent application? If not, we should include further technical details about your invention.

4. Do the broad claims (especially claim 1) have any unnecessary limitations? In other words, could someone use your invention without using an element of claim 1? On the other hand, does claim 1 include something that was not found in previously known or used devices or methods?

5. Are there any patents, papers, and other public materials of which you or any of the other inventors are aware that may be pertinent to the invention? Failure to disclose pertinent prior art to the Examiner could invalidate the entire patent. Note that you will have a continuing obligation to bring pertinent prior art to the Examiner's attention during the entire prosecution of the patent application. Note further that we have drafted the claims broadly based on the prior art of which we are aware. Consider whether you are aware of additional art that is pertinent in view of the breadth of the claims. If you do not understand the scope of the claims, please contact us to discuss this issue further with you.

6. Has there arguably been any non-experimental disclosure or use of the invention, or any offer for sale of the invention more than one year ago? If so, it will be necessary to bring this to the Examiner's attention. As a reminder, foreign patent rights may be barred by any public use or disclosure before we file.

7. Were any of the claimed ideas developed while working on a government contract? If so, we will need to disclose this information.